

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-15 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13-15 are amended by the present amendment. The changes to Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13-15 are supported in the originally filed disclosure at least at Figures 5A-C and 6 and the associated descriptions. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki, et al. (“Arrayed Air Jet Based Haptic Display: Implementing An Untethered Interface”, NTT Cyber Space Laboratories, NTT Corporation; herein “Suzuki”) in view of DeBerg (U.S. Patent No. 4,191,507), and Claims 6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Suzuki in view of DeBerg, further in view of Iwaki, et al. (JP Pub. No. 2004-157677, herein “Iwaki”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “the receiver including a concave center unit that *declines radially outward* from an axis of symmetry . . . *such that a shape of the concave center unit is a hemisphere*, and an inclined side surface unit that *inclines radially outward* . . . with respect to the axis of symmetry,” and “jetting a gas or a liquid from the selected nozzle upon the inclined side surface unit of the receiver to convey a force . . . *toward the axis of symmetry* of the receiver.”

In the outstanding Office Action, Suzuki was asserted to teach every feature of Claim 1 except “the receiver including a concave center unit . . . and an inclined side surface unit,” as defined by Claim 1, which DeBerg was asserted to teach.

However, DeBerg fails to cure the conceded deficiencies of Suzuki.

DeBerg describes a windmill (10) including a vertical central axle (12) and a triangular framework (14) supporting three circumferentially-spaced windmill vane arrays (11A-11C).¹ DeBerg further describes that the framework (14) and the vane arrays (11A-11C) are rotated by wind to provide torque for generating electrical power.² According to DeBerg, the wind causes a rotational torque to be applied to the axle (12) such that the axle (12) rotates between bearings (88) and (90), to drive a generator (92) geared for power generation.³

However, DeBerg does not describe or illustrate that any of the vane arrays (11A-11C) include a concave center unit or an inclined side surface unit as defined by Claim 1. Specifically, none of the vane arrays (11A-11C), as described and illustrated by DeBerg, *decline radially outward* from the axle (12) to form a shape of a *hemisphere*. Further, none of the vane arrays (11A-11C) incline radially outward with respect to the axis (12). In contrast, DeBerg illustrates that the vane arrays (11A-11C) extend outward from the axis (12) *without any inclination or declination* with respect to the axle (12) and *without forming the shape of a hemisphere*, at all.⁴ Therefore, DeBerg does not teach or suggest any “the receiver including a concave center unit that *declines radially outward* from an axis of symmetry . . . such that a shape of the concave center unit is a hemisphere, and an inclined side surface unit that *inclines radially outward* . . . with respect to the axis of symmetry,” as recited by Claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants note that the primary functions afforded by the structures of the concave center unit and the inclined side surface unit, as defined by Claim 1, cannot be achieved by the structures of the vane arrays (11A-11C) described by DeBerg. For example, as described at page 15, line 36, to page 17, line 8, and illustrated at Figures 5A and 6 of the

¹ DeBerg at column 1, line 65, to column 2, line 15, and at Figure 1.

² DeBerg at column 2, lines 1-5.

³ DeBerg at column 5, line 59, to column 6, line 20, and at Figure 5.

⁴ DeBerg at Figures 1 and 2.

originally filed disclosure, jetting air upon an inclined side surface of a receiver with only one air nozzle simply achieves a conveyance of a force *toward an axis of symmetry* of the receiver. Further, air jetted upon the inclined side surface flows out mainly laterally to an outside of the inclined side surface so that a force perpendicular to a jetting direction is relatively large compared to a force parallel to the jetting direction. In contrast, DeBerg describes that air jetted upon the vane arrays (11A-11C) achieves the conveyance of *rotational torque* on the axle (12) such that the axle (12) rotates between bearings (88) and (90), without describing that the air jetted upon the vane arrays (11A-11C) achieves the conveyance of a force *toward an axis of symmetry* of the axle (12).⁵ Therefore, DeBerg does not teach or suggest “jetting a gas or a liquid from the selected nozzle upon the inclined side surface unit of the receiver to convey a force . . . *toward the axis of symmetry* of the receiver,” as recited by Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 1 and Claims 2 and 3, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 9, and 13-15, although differing in scope and/or statutory class from Claim 1, patentably define over Suzuki for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to Claim 1. Further, Claim 7 depends from Claim 5 and Claim 11 depends from Claim 9, and, therefore, Claims 7 and 11 patentably define over Suzuki for at least the same reasons as Claims 5 and 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13-15, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 10 depend upon Claims 5 and 9, respectively, and, therefore, patentably define over Suzuki for at least the same reasons as Claims 5 and 9. Further, Iwaki, which is additionally asserted against Claims 6 and 10, fails to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Suzuki with regard to Claims 5 and 9 and is not asserted for the features of Claims 5 and 9


⁵ DeBerg at column 5, line 59, to column 6, line 20, and at Figure 5.

that are discussed above as deficient in Suzuki. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 6 and 10, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)

Jason M. Perilla
Registration No. 65,731